Case 3:07-cv-05596-SI	Document 64	Filed 09/10/2008	Page 1 of 4	

1	David M. King, Esq. (Bar No. 95279) Jeremy A. Burns, Esq. (Bar No. 239917)				
2	CARŘ, McCLELLAN, INGERSOLL, THOMPSON & HORN Professional Law Corporation				
3	216 Park Road P.O. Box 513				
4	Burlingame, California 94011-0513 Telephone: (650) 342-9600	• •			
5	Facsimile: (650) 342-7685				
7	Attorneys for Defendants City of San Mateo, Susan E. Manheimer, and Officer Joseph Yanuska, Officer Shandon Murphy				
8	8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	Jane Doe,	No. 07-5596 SI			
12	Plaintiff,	(Related to 08-02541 SI)			
13	vs.	SAN MATEO'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION AND REQUEST			
14	City of San Mateo, et al,	FOR AN EXTENSION TO OPPOSE THE PENDING MOTION TO DISMISS IN			
15	Defendants.	THIS ACTION AND MOTION TO CONTINUE INITIAL CASE			
16		MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE DATE OF OCTOBER 3, 2008			
17					
18					
19					
20	Jane Doe has filed a motion request	ing an extension to oppose a pending motion to			
21	dismiss in related case no. 08-02541. To t	the extent she seeks an extension to oppose San			
22	Mateo's motion to dismiss in this matter, San	Mateo objects.			
23	San Mateo filed its motion to dismiss of	on July 9, 2008, over three months ago. Originally,			
24	the motion was set for hearing on August 15,	2008. On July 11, 2008, the Court set the hearing			
25	for October 3, 2008, giving her two complete months to respond by Friday, September 12. There				
26	is no need to provide any additional time concerning San Mateo's motion to dismiss.				
27	Jane Doe also asserts that San Mate	o and its employees have wrongfully refused to			
28	comply with Rule 4 in the 08-02541 case. Th	at is incorrect. As explained to her by San Mateo's			
	26839.00008\BGLIB1\1380020.1	1 07-5596 SI			

1				
1	counsel, San Mateo is not subject to the waiver of service provisions of Rule 4(d)(1). San			
2	Mateo's counsel is currently attempting to obtain consent to appear on behalf of its individual			
3	employees for the purpose of filing a motion to dismiss.			
4	Dated: September 10, 2008			
5	CARR, McCLELLAN, INGERSOLL, THOMPSON & HORN			
6	Professional Law Corporation			
7	- My			
8	By:David M. King			
9	Attorneys for Defendants City of San Mateo, Susan E. Manheimer, and			
10	Officer Joseph Yanuska, Officer Shandon Murphy			
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27 28				
40 1	4			

26839.00008\BGLJB1\1380020.1

PROOF OF SERVICE

2

1

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

2425

26

2728

I am employed by the law firm of Carr, McClellan, Ingersoll, Thompson & Horn Professional Law Corporation in the County of San Mateo, California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 216 Park Road, P.O. Box 513, Burlingame, California 94011-0513.

I certify that the original papers filed with the Court and all copies of papers, documents, and exhibits, whether filed with the Court or served on other parties, are prepared on recycled paper.

On the date set forth below I served the within:

• SAN MATEO'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION AND REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION TO OPPOSE THE PENDING MOTION TO DISMISS IN THIS ACTION AND MOTION TO CONTINUE INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE DATE OF OCTOBER 3, 2008

on the parties in this action, by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Jane Doe 1700 N. Point, Unit 107 San Francisco, CA 94123

Harry S. Stern, Esq. Rains Lucia & Wilkinson LLP 2300 Contra Costa Blvd., Ste 230 Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Gregg A. Thornton, Esq. Selman Breitman LLP 33 New Montgomery, Sixth Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 Kathryn E. Alberti, Esq. DA San Mateo County 400 County

Center, 4th Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

Michael Dodson, Esq. Office of the City Attorney 200 East Santa Clara Street San Jose, CA 95113-1905

By placing in office mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed above and placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Burlingame, California.

By fax transmission. Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed above. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached.

BGLIB1\1373887.1

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: September 10, 2008

-22

Lori J. Stumpf

BGLIB1\1373887.1